



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,448	11/07/2000	Jack D. Pippin	423901674C2D	8694
22850	7590	01/30/2006		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
PROCTOR, JASON SCOTT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2123				

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/707,448	PIPPIN, JACK D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason Proctor	2123	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-11 and 13-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-11 and 13-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/12/05, 4/15/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Examiner of record in this application has been changed. The indicated allowability of claims 3-11 and 13-21 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Kenny and Emery (full citations found below). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claims 3-11 and 13-21 have been rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statement submitted 12 July 2005 cites a "Dynamic Power Management" IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin reference that has not been found in the record for this application. However, the Examiner has located and considered the reference, as indicated by the initials on the IDS. This reference has been provided and cited on form PTO-892 to ensure a complete record for this application.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 3, 7, 13, 14, and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2123

In claim 3, the phrase “to generate an interrupt if calculated average temperature” appears to omit the word “the” between “if” and “calculated”.

In claim 7, the phrase “wherein the threshold adjustment logic is further to program” appears to omit a verb between “further” and “to”, however it is unclear from the claim language if Applicants intend the verb to be “configured”, “operable”, or some other.

In claim 13, the phrase “comparing each of the plurality of sensed temperatures to a threshold generating an interrupt in response thereto” appears to omit the word “and” between “threshold” and “generating”.

In claims 14 and 20, the phrase “the plurality of difference sensed temperatures” appears to contain a typographical error, where “difference” should read “different”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 3-11 and 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,287,292 to Kenny et al. (hereafter referred to as Kenny) in view of US Patent No. 4,602,872 to Emery et al. (hereafter referred to as Emery).

Regarding claims 3, 10, 13, 14, and 20, Kenny teaches an integrated circuit comprising a single thermal sensor to generate a temperature value, a stored threshold value, and interrupt logic and generating an interrupt if the temperature value exceeds the stored threshold value [*“the temperature of an integrated circuit is regulated using a conventional temperature monitor and a novel power user regulator”* (column 1, lines 51-64); regarding **thermal sensor**, *“a temperature dependent resistor 501 would be mounted near the circuit to be mounted”* (column 9, lines 38-52); regarding **interrupt logic** and **threshold value**, *“When the temperature as indicated by a signal on line 505 reached a trigger value the power use regulator 502 would activate”* (column 9, lines 38-52); regarding **generating an interrupt**, *“The power use regulator might simply force the integrated circuit to low clock speed operation as long as the temperature is high,”* (column 9, lines 38-52) where an internal computer signal to communicate with other peripheral devices, such as controlling clock speed, is an interrupt].

Kenny does not expressly suggest using a **plurality of thermal sensors** or an **averaging mechanism** as recited by the claim.

Emery teaches a temperature monitoring system for an electric generator, including specific teachings applicable to monitoring complex systems. In particular, Emery teaches a **plurality of thermal sensors** [*“a plurality of temperature sensors are positioned... to derive*

Art Unit: 2123

respective signals indicative of the temperature of [components of the electric generator]" (column 2, lines 17-26)] and calculating an average temperature from the plurality of sensors [“the signals from all of the sensors are combined to derive an average” (column 2, lines 17-26)].

Emery expressly provides motivation for averaging the values from a plurality of temperature sensors [*“a temperature sensor during a malfunction may provide an abnormally high reading from its previous normal reading, however such condition will go undetected [in the prior art]. The present invention provides for an improved temperature monitoring system for such generator wherein early detection of an abnormally hot stator coil is made possible” (column 2, lines 2-14).* In more detail, Emery teaches comparing each individual sensor reading against the average sensor reading, thereby determining “how far from average” each reading is rather than merely determining “how hot” each reading is, and thus producing a more reliable measure of heat in the device (column 2, lines 27-54)].

As with Kenny, Emery teaches a **threshold temperature** and generating an alarm if the threshold temperature is exceeded, directly analogous with generating an interrupt in a computer processor [*“Each of the generated percentage indications may be compared with first and second alarm limits to appropriately notify the operator should either of the alarm limits be exceeded” (column 2, lines 50-53)].*

A person of ordinary skill in the art of thermal management and integrated circuit design, at the time of Applicants' invention, would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Kenny, to vary the clock speed of an integrated circuit in response to a measured temperature measurement in order to manage heat in the circuit, with the teachings of Emery, to average a

plurality of temperature readings and thereby produce a more reliable measure heat in the device. The combination could be achieved by replacing the single temperature sensor connected to the *power use regulator* (Kenny, *id.*) with a plurality of temperature sensors and calculating an average of the readings from the temperature sensors (Emery, *id.*).

Although Emery contemplates electric generators, the teachings relied upon in this rejection are directed toward thermal control of an electrical device. A person of ordinary skill in the field of thermal control in integrated circuits, when looking to the prior art for teachings of thermal control systems, would know and understand the applicability of thermal control to various electrical technologies and would therefore look beyond the narrow confines of thermal control in integrated circuits. For this and other reasons, the teachings of thermal control in Emery are regarded as analogous art to the application of thermal control systems in integrated circuits.

Where claims 10 and 20 refer to **displaying information regarding the calculated average**, Emery expressly teaches generating alarms (column 2, lines 50-53) and alarm checks coupled to a display (FIG. 5B, references 112, 116, 108; *“Display apparatus 108 is provided in order to present... the results of the computation of percent of average coil temperature performed by circuit 102... If either of these [warning limits] are attained, such indication may be displayed such as by flashing the particular value or by a change in color, if the display apparatus includes a color monitor”* (column 8, lines 11-28)). In forming the combination above, in light of the teachings of Emery regarding the display of alarms, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants’ invention to include the display features taught by Emery in order to alert a user of the integrated circuit that a

Art Unit: 2123

temperature threshold was surpassed, for example to prompt the user to adjust the usage of the integrated circuit and lower the measured temperature.

Where 14 and 20 define methods performed by the apparatuses of claims 3 and 10, these methods are performed by the combination formed above.

Regarding claims 4 and 15, Kenny expressly teaches adjustment logic to decrease a clock frequency in response to a signal indicating that the threshold temperature has been exceeded [“*The power use regulator might simply force the integrated circuit to low clock speed operation as long as the temperature is high,*” (column 9, lines 38-52)].

Regarding claim 5, wherein the **register is programmable by the integrated circuit**, Emery expressly teaches that the alarm limit values (*stored threshold values*) may be, “by way of example,” 3.0° C and 6.0° C (column 8, lines 46-49). Emery expressly suggests methods of calculating the alarm limits (column 8, lines 24-45). Emery clearly conveys to one of ordinary skill in the art that the alarm limit values (*stored threshold values*) should be adjusted to suit the needs of the application; that is, the means for storing or representing the alarm limit values (*register*) should be configurable or programmable. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants’ invention in the formation of the combination above in order to adjust the threshold values to suit the needs of a particular application.

Regarding claims 6-7, 11, 16-17, and 21, wherein **threshold adjustment logic** is used to **program the register to a different (and second different) threshold temperature** in response to an interrupt indicating that the threshold (and first threshold) temperature has been exceeded, these limitations construct a system where two signals are generated as the temperature exceeds a first and subsequently a second threshold, which is expressly taught by Emery [*“an alarm check circuit 112 is provided and is operable to compare each value provided by circuit 102 with a first or warning alarm limit, as well as with a second or shut down alarm limit”* (column 8, lines 11-28)]. The distinction between reprogramming a single threshold versus predetermining two distinct thresholds is considered an equivalent solution that would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. In forming the combination above, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to incorporate the concepts of Emery regarding the use of two thresholds in order to create a graduated thermal control system, such as one with a “warning” stage and a more critical “shutdown” stage (see Emery, column 8, lines 30-45).

Regarding claims 8 and 18, wherein the clock adjustment logic is used to **control the temperature of the integrated circuit by increasing and decreasing an integrated clock frequency**, this limitation is expressly taught by Kenny [*“The power use regulator might simply force the integrated circuit to low clock speed operation as long as the temperature is high... The circuits would operate as long as the temperature monitor indicated high temperature, but would deactivate and reset [restoring high clock speed] when the temperature fell to an acceptable level”* (column 9, lines 38-52)].

Regarding claims 9 and 19, Emery teaches a “shutdown” threshold (column 8, lines 30-45) which would convey to a person of ordinary skill in the art a teaching that there exists some temperature threshold which, when exceeded, should indicate that the system being monitored should be halted. Further, Official Notice is taken that halting a computer component to conserve power or dissipate heat is old and well-known in the art (See US Patents 4,851,987 to Day; 4,204,249 to Dye et al.; 5,025,387 to Frane; 4,823,292 to Hillion; 5,189,647 to Suzuki et al.; among others). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants’ invention to combine the teachings of Kenny and Emery, as cited above, and to incorporate the old and well-known method of halting a computer processor or component in order to conserve power or dissipate heat.

Conclusion

The prior art cited on form PTO-892 has been applied under 35 U.S.C. § 103, provided to support the use of Official Notice as applied above, or included to ensure a complete record for this application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Proctor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3713. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-4:30 pm M-F.


Art Unit: 2123

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached at (571) 272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason Proctor
Examiner
Art Unit 2123

jsp


Paul L. Rodriguez 1/19/08
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2125